

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in the above-identified application. It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated June 28, 2005.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Aoki et al.* (6,407,982). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection because anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference the disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. Here, the cited reference, *Aoki et al.*, fails to disclose the following claimed feature: *wherein the tray comprises a holder which secures, to the tray, the forward-end center section of the memory card mounted on the tray along the insertion direction of the tray.* [Claim 1]

In particular, element 5 of *Aoki et al.* does not disclose “a holder that secures a forward-end center section of the memory card on the tray.” Rather, the *Aoki et al.* device secures the disc with four projections “formed symmetrically with respect to the central line P1 of the disc tray 1.” [See column 9, lines 4-29 of *Aoki et al.*, which discloses that four engagement projections 5 and 6 are formed (i.e., “engagement projections 5 and 6 for preventing separation of the disc are formed at the outer ends of the opened side of the disc-receiving recess 2...(and) another pair of...engagement projections 5 and 6 are formed adjacent to the rear end 1b of the disc tray 1.”)] However, none of the projections secure the forward-end center section of the disc. Accordingly, this element of claim 1 is missing from the cited reference.

Draft Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Serial No. 10/765,187
Attorney Docket No. 042049

Also, *Aoki et al.* does not disclose “a tray comprising an elastic restraining piece (6) that secures a backward-end center section of the memory card.” Neither the specification nor Figs. 7A, 7B, or 7C disclose elastic restraining pieces securing *the backward-end center section* of the memory card. Accordingly, this element of claim 1 is missing from the cited reference.

In view of the remarks above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 2.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Aoki et al.* in view of *Yao* (6,050,848).

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow claim 3, as it depends from claim 1.

Applicants also disagree with the Examiner’s reasons for rejection of claim 3 for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner has mischaracterized the teachings of *Yao*. For example, *Yao*, figure 1, does not disclose a guide comprising “a pair of guards which demarcate a tray loading slot by sticking out from an edge of the metal cover and extend like cantilever beams from both sides of the width orthogonal to the insertion direction of the tray...” Even assuming that the hooks (14) disclosed in *Yao* do read on the pair of guards recited in claim 3, the hooks are not provided in the loading slot in the guide (claim 3.) Rather, the hooks (14) are provided in the adaptor base (14) of the *Yao* device (Fig. 1, column 2, lines 59-66.) Accordingly, even if one were to combine the references as characterized by the Examiner, the result would not be the claimed

Draft Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Serial No. 10/765,187
Attorney Docket No. 042049

invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the obviousness rejection of claim 3.

Applicants respectfully request that dependent claims 4-9 be considered upon allowance of generic claim 1.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the claimed invention distinguishes over the cited art and defines patentable subject matter. Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by applicants would be desirable to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned attorney.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Darrin A. Auito
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 56,024
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

DAA/meu